



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HISTORY OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN FRANCE, 1789-1870

M. Levasseur has issued two further volumes¹ as monumental in scope and compass as were the previous two dealing with the history of the laboring classes. In these latest volumes he treats the subject from 1789 to 1870 in great detail. The first volume discusses the period of some forty years from the Revolution of 1789 to the Revolution of 1830, and contains, as well might be expected, a tremendous amount of information such as the student of political economy and social science would have to hunt very far to find connected elsewhere. Workers in history as well as in economics can but feel sincere gratitude and admiration for the venerable author who has in this noble wise crowned his life-work.

M. Levasseur begins with pointing out that in 1780-86 the French government little knew how the foundations of the old structure of society were crumbling under the weight of new needs and the ideas of the century, although the condition of the treasury kept the ministers conscious of the pressing demand that something be done to close the constantly widening chasm of deficit. The king called upon the Estates to find some remedy for the prevailing financial disorder. The nation, however, in electing its representatives expected not only to remedy this evil, but to change the social order as well by overturning the absolute monarchy and establishing a society based on the freedom of the individual and on equality before the law. It was to be a peaceful revolution accomplished by the power of reason. The third estate was conscious of its rights and its strength, and became sure of its importance when the king accorded to it as many representatives as the two other estates combined. And it was the third estate which had the honor of speaking the loudest in favor of equality and the advantage of being able to join the authority of logic to the force of numbers. The electors of the third estate, however, did not represent all the commoners. In the cities the workmen had had no share in the vote, which was by corporations; hence their delegates were in many cases not considered by

¹ *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France, de 1789 à 1870.* By E. Levasseur. Paris: Rousseau, 1904. 8vo, 2 vols., pp. xix + 740 and 906.

them as true representatives, and the poor artisans complained of having been rudely repulsed and their rights neglected. Thus the exclusion of what was already termed the fourth estate left its trace on the legislative work of the Constituent Assembly.

The first great acts toward establishing the coveted equality were the declaration of the night of August 4, and the principles of social reformation and abolition of privileges set forth in the Declaration of Liberties which followed. "Haec nox est . . . ," as Camille Desmoulins puts it; "o vere beata nox!" And it must indeed have been a great moment, inspiring even to the coldest observer, however futile in its final results.

The *Constituante*, however, was there not only to pull down, but also to build up, and in order to meet the emergency a number of committees were formed among which were distributed the different branches of administrative and legislative work. As we follow M. Levasseur's account (pp. 14-76), we are amazed at the amount of hard thinking and creative planning this first Assembly, truly glorious with all its shortcomings, demanded from its committees. Each matter was generally introduced by an address by the representative whose specialty it was, and whose proposition, backed by the opinion of his colleagues in the committee, was used as the basis of debate, and often also of the decree which, with the king's reluctant sanction, became law for the land. The first matter of importance was taxation, and with a stroke of the pen, as it were, the Assembly abolished all the imposts and the dues which had made the life of the lower classes a burden and that of the nobility and clergy a sinecure. The treasury was to be reimbursed by taxes on property, on sundry other matters, and by duties on imports. The *Constituante* had a free field before it, none of the obstacles which had thwarted the plans of the monarchy now existing. Still it could not be helped that on the budget of 1791—a budget, however, which M. Levasseur declares fictitious, since it was in reality quite different—the expenses outnumbered the receipts by some 180 millions. The *Constituante* lacked a true basis for its calculations of income and expense, inasmuch as the old tax registers were either lacking or incomplete. The fiscal troubles of the Assembly are, however, recounted at some length elsewhere.

Another question was the suppression of the corporations and the establishment of industrial liberty—a move instantly decided upon in spite of the loud demonstrations to the contrary from the camp of

the workmen themselves, who either did not understand the true bearing of the matter, or, as was quite likely, expected the millennium and the exploitation by themselves of the employers and the rest of society. The edict of Turgot was made the basis of the final decree. The expenses caused by reimbursing the masters, who had paid quite heavily for their privilege, amounted to a sum such as the strained exchequer could scarcely bear, but the Assembly bravely shouldered the obligation and issued the order for liquidation. That this order remained to a large extent a dead letter was due to the general financial ruin and the fluctuation of values caused by the *assignats*. But the Assembly is nevertheless to be commended for its courage. M. Levasseur describes graphically the whole proceeding (pp. 25, 26), which was marred only by the haste with which everything had to be done in order to have reform keep step with the impatience of the Assembly. The author thinks that no doubt many important interests were wounded and vested rights trod under foot. Industrial freedom was the supreme consideration before which everything must fall. The commercial barriers to the inland trade fell too. The field of labor was to be swept clear of the many obstacles with which it had been incumbered; prices were henceforth to be fixed only as buyer and seller agreed. For the protection of home production, however, import duties were established, and while there were voices that advocated a tariff liberal beyond anything known before, the Assembly as a whole inclined more the other way, especially in regard to the English trade—a tendency which found its marked expression in the Navigation Act of 1793. M. Levasseur points out that, owing to its hurry and the lack of preparation for such work as it was called upon to perform, the *Constituante* succeeded in accomplishing but a fraction of what it had aimed at in connection with the reorganization of commerce. This not from lack of interest, but from insufficient practical experience. But whatever it left undone, the things it did in establishing the principle of freedom and equal rights were of so vast an importance as to entitle it to an honorable place among all the constituent assemblies in history and to the gratitude of the generations which have since enjoyed the fruit of its work. To quote the author's words:

Hence, while admitting the justice of a part of the criticism, we should recognize that when the *Constituante* retired it left man free to enjoy in full his rights; the land relieved of its burden, to be let, sold, exploited, by its owner, as he chose; all citizens equal before the law; all roads of labor open

to all; obligations, at least in principle, equally distributed according to the faculty of each; France united under one administration, lacking in cohesive strength, it is true, and afflicted with disorders, but at least a nation — this was truly great work (p. 47).

The great passion for social equality which carried the Convention to the extent of proclaiming conditions impossible in almost any society, and particularly in one so broken up and torn asunder as was the French, was not the foible of the *Constituante*. It proclaimed political equality as the basis of further progress, and many disasters might no doubt have been averted had the experience gained by the men who sat in the first been utilized for the second and third Assemblies instead of opening the door wide for theories of the most extreme type.

In a special chapter (chap. 3) M. Levasseur discusses the sufferings of the laborers owing to the dearness of food and the scarcity of work, and the efforts of the Assembly to relieve the popular distress. The Assembly, however, in its eagerness to see the end of all privilege and whatever smacked of the old régime, had aggravated the trouble and heaped Ossa upon Pelion for itself by doing away with institutions which might have guided it, and it had now to grapple with problems which rose anew every day. Of these, providing for the masses on the one hand, and preventing, on the other, their forming into bands, which could but hinder the orderly reorganization, were the most pressing. Quelling riots in the country, where the famished and ignorant peasantry celebrated the arrival of liberty by committing every outrage on life and property, and in Paris reducing beggary by finding work for the idle, taxed its capacity to the limit. The general lack of ready money and the depreciation of currency, rather than the influence of foreign competition upon commerce, were no doubt at the bottom of the general distress of all classes and of the necessity for strict economy. Thousands of shops and factories closed, and people went idle, inflamed by the revolutionary ideas, and demanding to be fed and clothed by the new liberal order of things. This demand the National Assembly tried loyally to meet by establishing workshops, and within one year wasted many millions on a plan which could but prove a failure. Beggary, the leprosy of the old monarchy, increased at a frightful rate and afterward (during the Convention) no remedy lighter than deportation to the colonies was devised for the most persistent form of it.

Talleyrand, and afterward Condorcet, introduced a plan for public instruction which contained features such as obligatory education, equality of the sexes, and university extension — plans of which only the nineteenth century in its later decades has brought the realization. It was unfortunate that this plan remained but a project, the *Constituante* leaving its fulfilment for the Assembly which was to follow it.

As compared with the *Constituante*, M. Levasseur thinks the Convention presents but a bewildering change of men and political factions moving across the scene and a constant proclamation of more utopian doctrines. In his opinion, while there is more likeness than difference between the Legislative and the Convention, there is more difference than likeness between the Convention and the *Constituante*. The communistic theories advanced by Robespierre and his set of political ultraists found their chief expression in the peremptory edicts which decreed the burning of title deeds and vestiges of proprietary rights in the interest of the people and the confiscation of the movables and immovables of the emigrants. The *Constituante* had made the former tenant a proprietor; the Convention assigned to the commoners large shares of the lands of the nobles, and thus rooted democracy in French soil as it was already rooted in French institutions (p. 84). No wonder that the French peasant has a tender regard for the Revolution even in its cruelest moods, however greatly he would be opposed to a repetition of its excesses, which he still fears might once more dispossess him. The chief aim of the Convention was the establishment of public safety, and it thought to do this by annulling the old property rights and creating new ones in the hands of a numerous class of small owners. In view of the attachment of the French peasant to the soil, this was an instance of how the greatest benefit to the largest number might justify the violent and otherwise wholly unjustifiable method.

To insure the absolute freedom of industry, the Convention forbade the formation of companies or societies, even life-insurance companies. In its opinion they were all exploiting the public for private gain. But while the Revolution thus discouraged individual and collective enterprise, it nevertheless used its power to forbid workmen whom it needed to enrol in the army, and instead drafted them into factories of its own in order to supply the needs of the administration and the army. So that in the name of public safety the Convention played fast and loose with the same principles

it at other times advocated so passionately. Thus, while the Convention inaugurated a splendid and liberal system of public instruction from the primary grade to the teaching of the fine arts, and had some high-flown notions about the proper organization of public charities, in the author's opinion it lacked after all the true regard for liberty which had dignified the acts of the *Constituante* and given lasting value to the work. Savage tyranny is sometimes allied with the most ardent heroism, and patriotic fervor and elevated ideas were here mixed up with crimes and deeds of violence such as have not only compromised the history of this epoch in the eyes of all unbiased observers, but have had their sinister after-influence in making the course of political progress in France one of repeated *coup d'états*, as if reform were identical with terrorism and bloodshed. Measuring the economic enterprise of France today with what it was more than a century ago, the author has to make the confession, rather painful for a historian and a Frenchman, that, compared with other nations, she seems steadily on the decline—a conviction which he seems to ascribe to the prevailing political unrest and, if we are not mistaken, to socialistic agitation.

M. Levasseur's instructive chapter on the *assignats* we find impossible to reproduce here even in outline, since it is one of the longest in the volume (pp. 112–50), but we hope by omitting it to increase the desire for reading it in full, inasmuch as this subject is most important for an understanding of the perplexed state of French society, and we have never found it treated more in detail than here. The author nowhere in his elaborate statement suggests any possibility of the Assembly being influenced toward establishing a paper currency of so enormous dimensions by the financial experiments of the American Revolution, but seems to regard the plan as original. There are, however, so many points of likeness between the two projects, at least in their inauguration, that there is some justification for supposing a connection. The American bills of credit, indeed, seemed based upon a surer footing, although they proved in the end as dismal a failure as the French paper. It is a pity that Mirabeau, while referring in one of his speeches to the disastrous experiment of the Americans, made of it a saving rather than a condemning clause for the home plan (p. 145). It is the more a pity that he did so in order to wreck the influence of Necker and Dupont, whose experience and sagacity might have aided the Assembly. But who could make common-sense objections heard in the teeth of a gale of

oratory such as Mirabeau when roused was in the habit of producing! In the estimation of the Assembly, impatient to make France solvent with a single masterstroke and lift the load of debt, such objections as came from Necker and others, moderate and cautious, were but prosy and availed nothing where furious declamation alone made an impression. The sophisms of Mirabeau and Pétion flattered the ears and displayed hopes such as no sound financier could find in his heart to utter. The story of the subsequent enormous issue of paper, which finally became a matter of speculation with sharpers, as usual hawking in human misery, reads like an exaggerated account of the mad whirl during the days of Law. The author considers these events a subject for useful reflections for the generations which came after, while the generation which brought them on denied itself time to reflect upon what it was doing.

When in 1795 the Directory came into existence it had a hard struggle to make its way between two such formidable obstacles to the restoration of order and the revival of labor, as war without and financial distress within. No wonder it succumbed when it attempted to prolong the disorder which it was established to combat. Agitators like Babeuf exclaimed that the Revolution had disappointed the just expectations of the workingman (p. 252), and the insurrection planned to reinstate labor in its true rights was interrupted only by the execution of its chief apostle. The wind, as the author says, blew in another direction; balls and festivals, gaudy costumes and luxury, were the rage. Now it was even good style to be considered a royalist. The constitution was a dead letter—to be repeatedly violated. The military successes of Bonaparte absorbed all interest and made the Directory care little what happened. But the economic situation was not improved. The revolutionary odor seemed to hover about any financial plan of the government, and capital in the form of ready money fled the treasury. Of course, France was still in a state of insolvency, incapable of paying the debts of the old régime and even of liquidating the interest; and, as regards industry, neither patriotism nor individual enterprise had produced any intellect brilliant or bold enough to cope with the overwhelming odds. The taxes came in irregularly. M. Levasseur estimates that when in 1795 the Convention ceded the administration to the Directory, more than 143 million livres were due, of which not one sou even in *assignats* touched the treasury. Foreign commerce was almost destroyed by the wars. No wonder that Napoleon, and in fact all the republican

generals, maintained their armies solely by plunder and forced contributions. Enormous sums were sent to France and lost in the always empty treasury as in a bottomless depth. That some sort of equilibrium be established seemed an absolute necessity, and some of the old forms of taxation were resorted to even during the Convention. The Directory made some hesitating attempts in the same direction, even renewing the obsolete tax on windows and doors, and resorted to forced loans from the moneyed classes. Mismanagement of the resources of the state has been forever the bane of French prosperity, and the Directory, at first timidly, but later boldly, entered upon a long-trodden path.² Impoverished industry was not helped by the rigorous policy of the Directory in prohibiting English merchandise. The English blockade of some of the chief harbors prevented exportation, and quantities of goods lay idle on the quays. In many of the cities brigandage was quite common, and the roads were infested by thieves. Such conditions soon destroyed capital in a country where the accumulated wealth was no longer maintained and renewed by incessant toil. The author informs us that the years 1789-99 were a long and painful crisis for the industrial towns. A list of the emigrants and the deported during 1793-99 from one department only shows an overwhelming number of merchants and husbandmen (p. 262, n. 5). In every direction there was evidence of manufacture and labor being at a standstill. The efforts of the Directory to remedy the evils somewhat by encouraging new enterprise had no particular effect, because the effort was generally misdirected, and also because men found it easier to live on the bounty of the state. In the country districts as in the towns, wages had increased largely because of the withdrawal of able-bodied men for the wars. The town population had diminished, while that of the country had increased. In 1789 the population of France was twenty-six millions. Twelve years later it was but a little over a million more, and the increase was largely due to the improvement of the rural classes. In 1795 a sack of flour cost 60 livres in money and 500 in *assignats*; but prices were easily doubled, as M. Levasseur shows in an anecdote which, whether true or not, pictures the situation (p. 276). "The French Revolution seems to have been made for the French peasantry," says an English tourist whom the author quotes in full (p. 277).

During this period of depression and languor the first exhibition

² The whole list of taxes is given on p. 257.

took place in 1798 on the Champ de Mars in Paris. The minister of the interior was its instigator, and in his opening speech he referred with much feeling to the torch of Liberty which now cheered labor. The torch of Liberty, however, did not illuminate very gloriously a country which once had the lead in industry. The appeal came too late and but few responded. Inasmuch as industry was looked upon as an engine of war by the government, the twelve medals accorded suggest but little progress in handicraft or in production by machinery.

As for the relation between employers and workmen, discipline had been undermined by the general upheaval. The reign of terror had sought some of its victims among *les petites gens*, but had generally devoted its interest to holding in awe what it considered the intolerable pride of the higher classes. Workmen often banded together and terrorized the neighborhood, and the situation had not improved during the Directory. The wonder is that under the circumstances anyone had wherewith to live at all, and the supposition is that *might* entered into its old place of *right*, and that under the benign light of the torch of liberty, everyone appropriated whatever he found. Few scenes appear more hideous than this. Some arrests were made, but justice and police protection were administered but fitfully according to the temper of the magistrate or the faction in charge. In regard to the actual state of wages the author finds it impossible to render any definite account. The enormous variation in prices caused by the *assignats* makes it well-nigh impossible to establish any real scale. Where capital is scarce wages cannot rise rapidly, and, if a rise is noticeable, it is largely neutralized by the accompanying rise in price of the necessities of life. The scarcity of labor, if anything, should have sensibly affected the amount of wages in industry as elsewhere.

The author rounds out the picture with some statements about the pedagogic aspirations of the Convention in general and the Directory in particular. Public instruction, in fact, received much attention on the part of both bodies, and the interest of the municipalities in this all-important issue was stimulated as much as possible. As yet the zeal was not great, and public schools were not viewed with special favor by the lower classes, whether rural or urban. In the north of France, however, the situation seems to have been encouraging. The private schools, which were not as a rule favorable to the Revolution, had better success (pp. 283-88). On the whole, it cannot be

said that the work of the Revolution had met with particular favor in this, perhaps its greatest undertaking, at least during the period in question. Schools and social disturbances seem to be antagonistic in spirit and aim. Order, peace, and good government appear to be the soil wherein education is most likely to thrive and bear its most precious fruits.

The French Revolution can boast of three constitutions, each attempting to modify and improve the other. With the year 1799, the ascendancy of Bonaparte to the sole power, and his policy of reconciliation, began the period of the reconstruction of authority in every department of state such as a constitution needs in order to prove effective. The creation of an efficient machinery of government by means of which France was actuated by one will, and under which no order remained ineffectual or disregarded, presented the other, and not less attractive side of the medal. The return to order was gratefully felt throughout France, and the immediate benefits were so great as to make all forget that this principle, too, might be carried to excess. The oppressive past was annulled, its traces obliterated, and a policy of peace was inaugurated which attracted a large number of emigrants. Only the republicans, in whom Bonaparte saw his most obdurate opponents, were treated with severity. By establishing responsible officers to collect and receive the taxes, funds were accumulated; for the first time interest on money began to be paid, and other timely measures re-established the credit of the state. Roads were repaired, canals were built, and bridges were reconstructed. Mounted police scoured the suspected districts, and within the short time of one year brigandage was effectively stamped out. The affection which Bonaparte inspired was, in the course of a few years, lost in the sacrifices which he demanded, and France came to regret the freedom she had given up so easily; but as yet the weariness was still in her limbs, and with the silence compelled by muzzling the press, and the prosperity of an efficient government, she kept her peace for eight years more. The codes, especially the civil code to which the name of Napoleon is attached, and in which are embodied the principles of the Revolution, were the most important part of this work of reconstruction. The regulation of taxes was another evidence of the zeal of the man at the helm. We leave to the reader the examination of the author's lucid presentation of the new imposts (pp. 326-29), as well as of the way in which the large cities, especially Paris, were provided for and famine averted.

Bonaparte knew from experience that nothing is more fraught with unwelcome consequences than scarcity of food combined with congestion of population (pp. 330-42), and it is only to be regretted that nothing better could be devised than returning to the regulations of the previous régime. The establishment of monopolies in certain branches of trade intervened between buyer and seller, and prevented free circulation even in so large a city as Paris. To illustrate the point, M. Levasseur introduces a comparison between the Roman Empire and the French, showing how in both instances fear of revolution caused direct intervention on the part of the administration, blocking individual initiative and causing still greater evils. During the famine of 1812 in Paris the government sold secretly from its stores, and thus brought on an aggravation of the panic (p. 341).

The views of the benefit of freedom and the drawback of monopoly change, and M. Levasseur tells us that the First Consul received numerous letters pleading for the restoration of the guilds so as to put an end to competition and prevent fraud. Napoleon's own opinion, however, formed itself but gradually. His love of order disposed him favorably toward regulation of trade, and yet as a son of the Revolution he wished to maintain the great principles it had established. Besides, he had seen enough to perceive that the true source of national wealth lies in the freedom of individual activity. Thus in the end industry was left free, and during the fourteen years of Napoleon's reign nothing was done to hamper the working of the principle (except when in the opinion of the imperial government the higher interests of the state demanded differently).

The author then proceeds to discuss the condition of the liberal professions, the university, the book trade, the theaters, and sundry other subjects, among which public credit, the banks, and especially the Bank of France, are of particular interest. The latter institution was a favorite with Napoleon, and for its future he had the most far-reaching plans (pp. 348-73). The re-establishment of public security and of credit infused fresh life into labor, and liberty had begun to bear its sweetest fruits when the conqueror's bellicose inclinations triumphed over the well-being of the nation. From the very first months of the new rule the regularity introduced into public service, the payment of interest in cash, and the creation of the Bank of France made money flow in and reduced the interest on loans. A contemporary said:

This France is so rich and so industrious that hardly has the tempest ceased when all signs of misfortune are obliterated, the workshops are again filled, new ones started every day, and had commerce not been interrupted by war, her prosperity would have been beyond comparison greater than during the old monarchy's most brilliant periods (p. 398).

A society was formed for the encouragement of national industry, whose most indefatigable member was the First Consul himself, and on whose roll figured such names as Berthollet, Chaptal, Lasteyrie, and others. Insatiable in his thirst for information, inspecting in person enterprises started for the purpose of benefiting commerce, Napoleon during his whole reign maintained the same solicitude, and manifested it whenever his many other operations allowed him the leisure. The splendor of the imperial court, the annual exhibitions, the revival of ease and display so dear to the French heart, contributed toward animating industry; but many years were still needed before the wounds inflicted by the Revolution were healed, and the victories of Napoleon could not make up for dangers to commerce emanating from the perpetual state of war. Still, until 1811 these crises were but slight shadows. In 1806 the emperor commanded that an exhibition take place as a part of the festivities devoted to the celebration of the triumphs of the French army (pp. 407, 408). The success of the undertaking seems to have been such that Napoleon could exclaim with a confidence which was wholly sincere: "The moment of prosperity has come; who dare place the limit?" In achieving this result science had united with industry and produced new and astonishing results (pp. 411-47). The introduction of steam as motor power, the utilization of chemistry for the improvement and beautification of textile fabrics, and the new mode of weaving invented by Jacquart effected a great change in taste as well as in the methods of manufacturing silk, cotton, and linen. Mining and the elaboration of metals likewise received a great impetus, the author furnishing tables to show the extent and value of this branch of industry (pp. 426, 427). In 1806 more than 150 smelting works and foundries sent specimens to the exhibition. To agriculture M. Levasseur devotes but a short notice (p. 430); it seems in all its branches to have flourished beyond expectation. But to the returns from the textile industries, as the most important in which France had from olden time excelled, the author devotes many compact pages. The arts, too, received some encouragement, although Napoleon can never be considered a connoisseur nor a true

patron of art. It served to magnify his greatness, or the greatness of his success, as it had performed the same service to French rulers before, and thus in his estimation it admirably fulfilled its mission.

Of far greater consequence for the proper valuation of the Napoleonic régime is the impetus given to French commerce and the results of the continental system. Thirteen thousand four hundred leagues of road repaired or constructed, eighteen rivers made navigable, bridges built, tunnels and canals, Paris beautified — these were but the prelude to what the emperor expected finally to accomplish. He was impatient of delay and constantly planned new enterprises; marshes were drained, and schools were established for the better instruction of engineers. If Napoleon had but confined himself to governing France, what an excellent example of an efficient master-builder and entrepreneur he might have set by his prodigious activity and his just eye for her needs! He would have fully deserved the devotion with which his zeal was greeted by a gratified nation which had never quite known what it was to be well served by those who had assumed the scepter of command. But whatever he did for French internal commerce, he could not, with England and Germany against him, achieve for French commerce abroad. And his final decision to exclude English trade from the continent was but a two-edged sword which cut his own as much as it wounded the enemy's, and which will always appear to succeeding ages as the revival of barbarism. Napoleon's confiscations of English goods only too frequently smack of the ethics of a master-pirate. The decrees of Berlin and Milan were acts of merciless despotism by a man who knew he could triumph only by the spoliation of both friend and foe. An excuse may perhaps be found in the emperor's desire to make French industry independent. Particularly were his efforts directed toward the cotton trade. Experiments proved, however, that the cultivation of the cotton plant on French soil was, for commercial purposes, a failure. A plan for making sugar at home, in spite of all the inventive genius brought to bear upon the problem and the enthusiastic encouragement from the emperor, also failed to prove a commercial success. The experiments with the sugar beet, to the cultivation of which the emperor had assigned some 30,000 hectares, seemed nearer a happy outcome, but the experiment was interrupted by the war. The author calls this protracted commercial conflict a duel to the death between two adversaries determined not to give or demand quarter, and his remarks are characterized by fairness to both friend

and enemy. To the impartial observer it seems as if France's were the losing cause, and as if, with all Napoleon's obstinacy, England would have triumphed, owing to her maritime supremacy.

The Revolution had enriched the peasant class and made it more enlightened both in ideas and manners. New modes of cultivation began to be introduced, the number of vineyards increased, and also the number of acres laid out in the cultivation of the potato. Every inch of soil was utilized in one way or another, farms were well stocked, and food was plentiful. And as the peasantry felt secure and happy, so also the middle class, the city population, enjoyed liberties and opportunities unknown before. But industry lives partly from variation in luxuries, and as the nobles and the wealthy proprietors saw their fortune melt away under the confiscations of the Revolution, their purchasing power became paralyzed and luxuries became rarer. The consulate changed this somewhat, and the workman again assumed his customary duties. Still, in the eyes of the imperial government, the welfare of the working classes was of minor importance compared with that of industry. The workingman's personal liberty was restricted by police regulations, and the principle of subordination to his employer was established by law. The chains of apprenticeship had fallen, and the necessity of thoroughly learning a trade became henceforth a matter of personal choice rather than an obligation. Yet the number of apprentices seems not to have decreased, largely because of the greater need of ready help, and workmen now, often at their own expense, engaged an apprentice to work with them in the employer's shop. The quality of workmanship seems not to have suffered by the change, but the wage question is somewhat obscure. M. Levasseur again gives us a list of wages collected from different departments and industries (pp. 500, 501). During the empire, in certain fields of labor, wages rose rapidly because of greater demand. The working day, which during the Revolution had been twelve hours or more, remained somewhat the same, with the exception of the two hours of rest granted at meal times. In summer a mason earned from 3 to 5 francs in Paris, a skilled carpenter 3 francs, a painter 4. Elsewhere wages were probably lower. The report in March, 1807, of the prefect of police in regard to the prevailing salaries in Paris is well worth reading (p. 502). The limited space prevents us from reproducing it here. According to a contemporary statement, the average of wages was 30 sous a day for artisans, as compared with 20 before

1789. As we perceive, not an extraordinary increase! The drafting of soldiers and the movement of the population kept prices up. The youth of the land, from twenty to twenty-five years of age, and later even younger, was taken away to be scattered broadcast over the battlefields from Cadiz to Moscow. But the greater demand for workmen facilitated marriages, and mortality and births seem for a while to have kept pace better. The year 1809 marked the height of prosperity, and during this year were registered 185,000 more births than deaths. A list gives the increase of population for every year during 1800-14 (p. 505). The young men evaded the duty of enlisting for a murderous war by marrying early, and in 1813 there were 165,000 marriages more than in the previous year. The dread of military service rested like a black cloud over the laboring classes. During the Revolution there had been voluntary enlistment owing to patriotic enthusiasm. During the empire, in spite of the instinctive bravery of Frenchmen, the hardships of war and the rumor of battles from which nobody ever returned caused wholesale desertion, and parents, friends, and employers aided in concealing the refractory recruits and caused the imperial government to use such rigor as to make itself cursed in the homes and bitterly hated by the workingmen. Another cause of discontent was the crisis with which the imperial government ended, and which centered in the capital. Of the more than 60,000 workmen fully one-third went idle. Workshops were again opened, but they were but a palliative, and the idlers came dangerously near creating a revolt. From 1794 to 1814 nearly a hundred societies for mutual aid and improvement were founded in Paris and other cities, but seem not to have accomplished much. The reports of the prefect of police speak of some 90,000 workmen in Paris alone divided into branches or trades. To all of them he ascribes many sins and few virtues. But, as has already been pointed out, the government cared little how the workman fared, as long as he was not in want of work — this safest remedy for all social evils. Trade unions were still in existence, keeping intact their customs and their abuses. But, in spite of turbulence of manner, they were on the whole composed of honest fellows who kept the bad elements out and were helpful to the unfortunate. Their rites and customs the author describes quite fully (pp. 513-19). As for the personal attitude of the emperor toward the working classes, the author thinks him neither indifferent nor hostile to their welfare. He even had now and then a word to

say which showed they were not forgotten. But the age was weary of theories, and the workmen themselves not being sufficiently enlightened seriously to advocate their own interests, the educated classes turned their attention elsewhere, and Napoleon was in this particular neither better nor worse than the rest. While active in aiding the charities and in establishing better care of the sick (having so many invalids by the war to provide for), the imperial government showed itself severe in all cases of vagabondage and beggary. Beggars and tramps were either sent to houses of correction or deported as before. Imprisonment from three to six months was the general form of punishment, which in cases of beggary might be extended even to two years, if the beggar was arrested outside his canton. Yet even the empire was not without a feeling of restraint in the matter, and depots—half hospitals, half prisons—were established where the beggar was detained and compelled to work. Unfortunately, these workhouses quickly became schools of theft and debauchery, and served to hinder rather than to help the free industry. What was needed was to raise the moral level of the lower classes, and for such instruction also Napoleon was destined to do a great deal. The author considers his recalling the Christian Brethren and the Sisters of St. Charles his greatest act. Especially after his return from Elba Napoleon would have done even more, if he had had the time. But, as it was, the imperial system remained incomplete in the matter of popular instruction.

M. Levasseur finishes the volume with a special book devoted to the Restoration, the most important portion of which is the chapter discussing the opposition among the laboring classes. But we can call attention only to his treatment of the events and movements which caused the July Revolution, especially the revolution in ideas caused by the beginning of social studies and of political economy, the doctrines of St. Simonism, of Fourier, and of the other social utopists, with a very full account of which, and with a very fair-minded and correct estimate of their scientific and moral value, this first volume most properly ends.

M. Levasseur's second volume treats of the remaining forty years from the July Revolution to the Franco-Prussian War—a period with which the greater portion of the reading public is probably more familiar than with the foregoing. The same qualities for which we commended the first volume, and, in fact all the volumes of this his-

tory, are in fullest measure present also in this. M. Levasseur in speaking of the causes of the July upheaval, thinks that the Bourbons, in spite of being strangers to the new France, might at least have given her the two blessings denied her during the reign of Napoleon — the blessings of peace and of constitutional liberty; but they unfortunately failed in the end to do either. The press was muzzled from the very start, and the danger, overwhelming at first to the small proprietors, of having their lands taken away and given to the emigrant nobles served to estrange this large class from the new government. Although it did what it could for the furthering of commerce, the Bourbon administration was hampered by the antiquated notion that everything was there to serve the welfare of the government rather than the governed. The reactionary tendency irritated all classes, and the government, catering in its commercial policy to certain favored interests, created ill-concealed disgust. Yet France flourished, savings banks were founded, instruction improved, and the government showed itself charitable and sympathetic toward suffering. In spite of prosperity and the pleasing illusion which the Bourbons entertained of their wise rule being the sole cause of good times, their government was looked upon with antipathy by the laboring classes. Some of the prejudices of the latter were unreasonable, but while the empire gave them at least the appearance of sharing in the glory which fell to the nation, the Restoration offered them nothing. When the Bourbons returned the second time, this feeling was aggravated by the government not daring to punish crimes committed from party hatred, and from which the Bonapartists had especially suffered. After 1815 there was nothing but dislike for the king among the masses. The return of the Jesuits and the rise of clericalism and its effects on the policy of Charles X. merely clinched matters. As far as France was concerned, it was to her as if the world had been moved seventy-five years back, and as if all that had happened since 1787 had been dexterously effaced. The political conflict which caused the July Revolution is so well known that we need not refer to it here, and, however greatly the violence must be deplored which accompanies such upheavals, the fault unquestionably lies at the door of those who violated the spirit of the charter rather than with those who felt the situation fast becoming intolerable and who acted in consequence. It was a revolution for ideas rather than hard and fast political principles, and it was the working classes which started it with the purpose in mind of re-establishing the

republic. Again, the result fell short of the object fought for. Whether by trickery or from lack of decision, the power fell to the younger branch of the detested family, and it was declared that what France needed was a popular monarchy surrounded by republican institutions. The republicans being greatly in the minority, the situation had to be accepted, even without the republican institutions or the popular monarchy. It is a fact repeatedly stated, and as often forgotten, that neither commerce nor industry ever gains anything from revolutions, and the many riots afterward were not due half as much to political disappointment as to lack of work (pp. 6-16). M. Levasseur devotes considerable attention to the part played now and later in the labor question by the St. Simonists, Père Enfantin, Fourier, and others. His description of these men and their propaganda is indeed the most complete we have so far met with (pp. 16-65). These socialistic doctrines and the debates of the French economists met with little interest from the ruling classes, however, and the February Revolution was at their door before the latter were clearly aware of whither the current had been running.

The government of Louis Philippe maintained the broad lines of commercial and industrial legislation laid down by the empire and accepted by the Restoration. The particular interests represented by the rich manufacturers and the bourgeoisie triumphed over the good of all, and although some minister sought the happy medium and tried to find out the truth by making inquiries as to the general opinion, the compelling power of the other tendency was so great that his moderate policy exercised but little influence on the modification of duties and the reduction of the tariff. On the continent protection was supreme, in spite of the fact that England, a rich country, had opened its ports to the commerce of all and was constantly growing richer. The ideas of free trade found an echo among French economists, but, in the face of the hostility of the working classes and the general indifference of the public, their arguments effected nothing. The doubling of French commerce from 1825 to 1847 seemed, indeed, to vindicate the wisdom of the other side (p. 92).

M. Levasseur next treats of the railroads—a subject we seldom find given the attention it deserves. The introduction of steam accelerated everything. At the same time, we find the government doing a great deal for the extension and perfection of the system of roads and canals; and for this reason many other faults of the Bourbon régime may readily be forgiven. The same administration,

however, could not help hindering transportation by minute regulations as to the kind of vehicle and the size of the load permitted to pass on the beautiful roads, thus increasing the cost of goods for the consumer. The author gives a long review of the beginnings of railroads and steam navigation (pp. 97-117), the first railroad being started by a private concern, and the government confining its activity largely to making a close inspection of the proposed routes. A note (p. 102) contains the concessions given during the reign of Louis Philippe. Numerous experts and writers of note advocated the extension of the system of roads, and the matter was thus steadily kept before the public. Still voices of doubt were as frequently heard as to the safety of such investments. Blanqui in 1838 declared himself convinced that this mode of transport would be found too expensive to attract much merchandise, and that the peasant would rather travel on foot with his burden, notwithstanding the attraction of speed. His opinion and that of the minister of commerce are both instructive reading (p. 107). Today it is a fact that the agricultural population with preference employs the railroads both for carrying their produce and for traveling themselves. (*Tempora enim mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis!*) The remark of Arago that, owing to the low temperature in tunnels, people were thrown from heat into sudden cold and made subject to pulmonary diseases (p. 108) is quite a sample of an immoderate fear of the unknown invoking specters, if nothing else does. From 1837 to 1847 enormous sums were spent on the encouragement of railroad-building, and probably may, from 1842 on, account to some degree for the annual deficit in the budget. The employment thus offered a large number of people, the acceleration and concentration of trade, and the useful occupation of energy and capital benefited France beyond expectation, while the accompanying evils were as yet less visible.

In a following chapter the author records the legislation in the interest of industry, especially the measures taken by the Assembly to protect children in factories and in the mines. At first it was proposed that administrative supervision should penetrate both to the workshop and the family hearthstone. The friends of freedom, however, warned against interfering with parental authority and complained of intolerable officiousness on the part of the government. Although the evil of child labor was not so widespread nor of so dreadful a character as in England, yet it existed, and the ministry had ordered an inquiry as early as 1839. The law voted in 1841,

owing to the resistance on the part of the manufacturers, remained but one of many half-measures which soon became a neglected letter, and before it could be improved the February Revolution interfered.

Whatever faults the July monarchy possessed — and its adversaries assure us it had serious ones — M. Levasseur thinks it gave the laboring classes the greatest of all blessings — regular and systematic instruction (chap. 5). The question had been agitated during the Restoration, and it had been truly said that it was not enough to teach children to read and to write and count, and that their knowledge must be raised to a higher level before they could boast true enlightenment. The new government hastened to increase the number of primary schools by voting twice as much money as before for public instruction. The law of 1833, which bears the name of Guizot, and which our author calls a monument to French civilization, made provision for primary education of a lower and a higher grade, leaving opportunity for future growth according to need. Each commune was instructed to keep an elementary school of inferior grade, while all with more than 6,000 souls should besides have one of higher order, and every department should support a primary normal school for the education of teachers. M. Levasseur describes very lucidly the progress of education in France during this period, and although the plans of M. Guizot have since been severely criticised, he thinks they gave all that in reason could be demanded. At the end of the reign of Louis Philippe three and a half million children of both sexes were registered in the public and private primaries, as compared with 1,937,000 in 1832. The number of schools rose from 39,460 in 1840 to 63,000 in 1847.

The following chapter, treating of the commercial crises of 1830 and 1837, of the exhibitions and their influence upon industry, we feel constrained to leave out, and proceed instead to what is said of the condition of society and the well-being of the workmen. The statistics published for the years 1840-45 were the first comprehensive ones of their kind and covered some sixty departments, Paris excluded. Within these it was estimated that there were 47,390 industrial concerns occupying each at least ten workmen, their value estimated at 34 millions, and their production at 3,648 millions. Whether this be correct or perhaps somewhat overestimated, the total certainly was encouraging, especially since the number of workshops employing less than ten workmen were not taken into account. Further inquiry established the distribution of different industries among the cities

(pp. 212, 213). The condition of the apprentice seems to have remained very much the same. In 1848 there were in Paris 19,114 apprentices—one apprentice for every seventeen workmen—their apprenticeship lasting from two to five years. Only one-fifth worked under written contract, and verbal agreements were on the whole much disregarded. Apprentices were scarcely employed beyond the lesser industries. Children occupied in factories as a kind of apprentices received wages. The apprentice was no longer under the supervision of the master, and in 1828 a society was formed to come to the aid of poor young boys who needed a home and an education fitted to their social position. To make honest fellows of them, industrious artisans and Christians—in one word, men—was the ultimate object of this aid. Children without family were given their board and lodging, those with a family were simply assisted, and every Sunday all were gathered in the “home.”

Savings banks were much favored by the July monarchy, the law of June 5, 1835, making them into a national institution. Arrangements made it easy for workmen who wandered about to change their savings from one bank to another. Three thousand francs were placed as the limit of the deposits of each depositor, but this amount was afterward considerably reduced. The treasury was charged with the payment of interest, which created a danger by thus allowing an indefinite increase of the floating debt. This mistake, however, was corrected afterward. In 1848 there were 1,364 savings banks, with some 200 filials, and the chief towns of every department each had one. January 1, 1848, there were 736,951 depositors, to whose credit stood the respectable sum of 358 million francs. This, if nothing else, should indicate the growing independence of the workingman, especially at a time when lotteries were still in vogue and many might thus be tempted to waste their savings. The author thinks that with a better organization labor might have benefited from a portion of this capital, if prudently invested. But in the hands of the government it was a constant embarrassment—a debt liable to be called in at a week's notice, and therefore a matter of great expense. Mutual-aid societies answered to more immediate needs, and the number seems to have increased very rapidly. In 1847 alone there were 2,056 of them, with a savings-bank account of more than five and a half millions.

The author has much to say about the moral condition of the working population. Weak in itself, it was surrounded by corrup-

tion and vice, and thus easily led to debauchery and crime. Philanthropists contemplated with terror that in ten industrial departments out of 10,000 young people, 9,930 could not pass inquiry as to morality, as compared with 4,029 in ten agricultural departments. It was, however, not just to throw the responsibility for this low state of moral condition on the congestion of population in the cities, or on the dangers and hardships of modern industry. Many employers indeed aggravated matters by their greed and evil example; others, and these often the most well-to-do, spent a large portion of their fortune on making the life of their workmen profitable both in regard to mind and body. Some were inclined to ascribe the lamentable lack of moral restraint to the new education which created in the workman desires which his condition did not permit him to satisfy. The author tells us that from 1828 to 1840 the number of workmen who knew how to read and write rose to 52 per cent., while the number of persons of the same class accused of crime fell (we take it) to 18 per cent. Hence instruction helped to avoid temptations rather than otherwise. In this connection the author notes the first formation of co-operative labor largely brought on by the strikes and the counter-combinations on the part of the employers. Buchez's constant preachings of the usefulness of association among the otherwise helpless workmen had much to do with it (p. 249). These associations, however, were more in the nature of syndicates with an inalienable capital formed in order to take up the fight with the employers and try to worst them. Several of these concerns did well at first, but in the end did not know how to handle the trade; hence their clients paid them badly, and they went into bankruptcy (pp. 249-51).

The question of well-being has an intimate relation to morality, but both are surely in a pronounced degree dependent upon the matter of wages. At least during 1841 in a number of industries wages seem to have varied between 1.50 and 2.50 francs per day. Four years later, according to general estimate, wages averaged 2.50 francs for men and 1.25 francs for women (with the usual variations according to place and occupation). Almost all kinds of wages were affected by the crisis of 1848, and an approximate statement gives 1.78 francs for men, 0.77 for women, and 0.50 for children. In very few departments women's salary rose as high as 1 franc, and there were cantons where wages were but 60 centimes. Besides reducing wages, the crisis reduced the number of wage-earners as well (p.

265). In 1837 at Sedan 12,500 weavers were employed at an average of 2.50 francs; the crisis of 1830-31 reduced the number to 5,000, and the wages to 1.50 francs. Industry again picked up, but in 1835 there was again a reduction to 9,000 workmen at 1.50 francs. Thousands of workmen were repeatedly left in a state of need, which private and public charity succeeded only imperfectly in relieving. M. Levasseur thinks that even when the workmen received good wages, as in a city, lodging, food, and clothing soon reduced his earnings to a minimum; and, however often statistics attempted to frame his budget for him, in spite of his thirteen to fifteen hours of work, it almost always was compelled to end with a deficit (pp. 271-75). Toward the end of the Restoration period 720 francs a year seem to have been the living average. During the time of Louis Philippe it was estimated that with 760 francs a family of five persons were in a state verging on misery, and with a hundred more would get through comfortably. Others, however, considered 860 francs insufficient in large cities. Five hundred and two francs was considered the lowest estimate of cost of living for a bachelor, and 750 for a married couple without children. Taking the medium, from 400 to 800 francs seem to have been the limits of what a workingman might expect to be able to get along on. To reduce the lodging expenses, the workmen with their families clustered in unhealthy hovels, paying every week in advance for the miserable dens where children died as soon as they were born. The worst factory was counted a more attractive place than these squalid holes. Nevertheless, considering France as a whole, mortality was not so great as might be feared — 25 per 1,000 during 1821-40, and only 23.3 during 1841-50. Compared with these are 30.8 births during 1820-30, 29 during 1831-40, and 27.4 during 1841-50 (p. 277). At the same time, food inclined to become cheaper. The harvests during the reign of Louis Philippe had several times gone beyond everything hitherto recorded (more than 80 million hectoliters in 1840 and 1846), and at least the staple of life was present in plenty for the common people. In Rheims, the author tells us, they had excellent bread and meat twice a week. In the country everything was even cheaper. In the cities consumption of bread and meat, and of other articles, such as wine, sugar, coffee, and tobacco, which to Frenchmen are among the necessities of life, increased, especially in Paris — a good sign! Enterprises grew in number, and the issue of licenses increased from 1,133,000 in 1832 to 1,517,000 in 1843. The

census of 1851 recorded 1,331,260 individuals engaged in industry on a large scale, of whom 124,133 were masters, 675,670 workmen, apprentices, or clerks, and 531,437 women; 4,713,026 persons were engaged in the lesser industries—altogether, 6,044,286 persons. Thus in the large industries there were some ten workmen to each employer, while in the smaller branches there were probably not more than four. M. Levasseur closes the chapter with a comparison between the industrial condition under Louis XVI. and under Louis Philippe, and with a brief discussion of the political situation which reveals the unpopularity of the government, especially among the masses. Louis Philippe soon found how mistaken he was when he thought he held all France in the hollow of his hand, because he fancied himself secure in the majority of the chamber. De Tocqueville had already sounded the alarm and warned that revolution was not far off. “France was asleep on a volcano.”

For the remainder of the volume it is necessary to be very brief. What follows is generally too well known. To hold the affections of the masses, the socialistic revolution of 1848 had, upon the instigation of Louis Blanc, created a labor commission. This commission met for the first time March 1, established a ten-hour working day, and acted as arbiter between the workmen and the employers, the latter being frightened by this headlong march of events. The ideas of Louis Blanc triumphed for a time and gained for the famous agitator the election to the new *Constituante*. Other popular measures followed, imposts were sacrificed, and the treasury was again to be reimbursed by an income tax which would especially affect the wealthier classes, and which eventually succeeded in alienating both these and the landed proprietors from the cause of the revolution. The workmen showed their willingness to support the treasury with their purse; but what could a couple of hundred thousand, or even millions, do for a government which above all things needed funds? Owing to the split in its midst, the provisional government could do nothing, and resigned. M. Levasseur considers the Revolution of 1848 almost an accident, which, however, had serious consequences, and at least created one important change in French institutions—that of universal suffrage. In this connection he recounts the financial crisis which ruined the cause of the savings banks as national institutions and caused the failure of a great many. The provisional government called in all outstanding money and decreed the immediate establishment of national workshops. The battle in the streets,

and the declaration of General Cavaignac that order had triumphed over anarchy, is very interesting reading (pp. 383-94). M. Levasseur, on the whole, gives much space to the political events which crowded the epoch, and wherein, for all we know, he may not have played the part of a mere spectator. It is certain that the news of the rising of the populace came as a breath of fresh air to all Europe, and in Paris, where the violence of discussion set all opinions free, it was like a stormwind clearing an overheated and sluggish atmosphere. The theory of the freedom of labor, however, did not disappear with the national workshops; explanations and remedies for the evils of the time crossed one another like flashes from an electric battery. The Assembly, in whose inexperienced hands it was given to make a new departure in economics, lacked unity and preciseness of ideas. It repulsed socialism and had the instinct of liberty without understanding its elements. The new constitution contained a great deal about liberty, and surely none ever showed greater solicitude for the rights and the welfare of the people; but the work was but half performed, and the adjustment of principle to life was left to future generations. The peculiar seething condition of French society and the dread of the revolutionary tendencies of the lower classes are evident, and it is a peculiar perversity of circumstance that in France reform never seems to penetrate more than skin-deep. Perhaps it is the susceptibility of French commerce to crises and the loudness of the complaints uttered which make the history of the labor movement in France singularly exhausting reading. The socialistic propaganda was nowhere more clamorous than during this period. The Assembly, however, soon undertook its reforms without even consulting this faction. M. Levasseur considers the work of the *Constituante* liberal and even charitable toward the masses to a degree never before witnessed; yet it was without real understanding of how to employ the right methods, and was inclined to reactionary measures, especially after the riot of June 13, 1849. Again, industry assumed somewhat its former aspect. The rupture between the Chamber and the prince president, who appealed to the masses, ended the republic, and left to the second empire its heritage of universal suffrage and interest in and care for the welfare of the laboring masses — or, as the author expresses it, the largest number.

We pass by the recital of the *coup d'état*, and the revival of the Napoleonic ideas which had so singularly professed the cult of liberty and denied its essence. The new autocrat had a following among the

country people, the city middle class, and the workmen, as well as the support of the clerical party. The spirit of enterprise, which above all demands a strong government, again revived, and France saw the establishment of great institutes of credit. The wars extended the influence of French capital even when they strained its resources. Yet France scored her greatest triumph in the splendid commercial and industrial advance within her own borders. Education was furthered by the ceaseless energy of an excellent minister. But the laboring classes were not dazzled; they considered themselves slighted by the emperor's rather ambiguous policy, and remained indifferent, and even hostile, to his advances.

What especially characterized legislation on labor during the second empire was the desire to strengthen authority while loosening the bonds of industry. A decree forbade the opening of a tavern without permission, and the prefect had the power to close any establishment deemed hostile to public security. But butchers and bakers were relieved from the limitations which had hitherto hampered their trade, and the result was neither a fall nor a rise in prices, but an increase in consumption—113 million kilograms in 1864 as compared with 52 millions in 1849; and bakeries grew rapidly in numbers, there being no less than 305, including bread depots, in Paris alone. Common bread was subject to a stable price, but thrifty bakers made their profit in pastry. The right of workmen to form associations for their improvement was conceded. The law of 1864 acknowledged freedom of association, but strict repression of violence and fraud. The law, however, was badly received by the propertied classes, and scarcely less so by the workmen themselves, whom their political organs had made suspicious toward anything, whether good or bad, emanating from the government. M. Levasseur very ably presents the pros and cons of the question (pp. 510–20). He devotes a lengthy chapter to the expositions, and the growth of science and invention, and then proceeds to discuss the treaties which reduced the duties on raw material and supplied the population with cheaper bread at the time of bad harvests. The emperor himself evidently favored free trade, or what was nearly so (p. 589), and the author considers the vastness of his scheme its chief drawback. But while the Chamber yielded, the upper house stood firm, and the minister had his project returned for reconsideration (pp. 593–611). The liberal policy of the government naturally caused great changes in the various industries which had grown up

in the shadow of protection and were as yet not fitted to take up competition with foreign production. M. Levasseur truly says that protection left to itself is condemned to perpetuity. As capital became more widely engaged and large enterprises were started, production naturally strove toward increased cheapness in order to hold its own in the foreign and the home market. The author gives us an idea of the battles fought in the Chamber during 1868 and 1870 between the two camps. The chapter closes with a statistic survey of the duties imposed and the growth of industry.

Industry creates concentration of productive power and of the people who do the work. While in 1846 the total population of the eighty-six departments had been nearly 35½ million, in 1866 it was almost 2 million more—an increase of which the cities chiefly got the benefit, not only absorbing the actual surplus, but drawing from the agricultural districts as well. In 1846 there were, besides Paris, only three cities with 100,000 inhabitants, and their 1,540,000 represented 4.03 per cent. of the total population of France. Twenty years afterward eight cities claimed to be in this category, with 3,126,000 inhabitants—that is, 8.21 of the total. Of the 600,751 inhabitants which France gained during 1861–66, 458,421 lived in cities of more than 10,000. Until 1846 there had been but twelve departments whose population was on the decrease, during 1846–51 there were twenty-two such, and 1851–66 their number was respectively fifty-four, fifty-seven, and fifty-eight. The author goes on to state that the increase in the population of Paris in 1866 amounted almost to two million souls. The chief attractions of city life were the higher wages, the greater opportunity for work, and, added to other things, the opportunity for pleasure, good or evil; for the people, like children, love *fêtes*. The old trade unions seemed for a while doomed to extinction; but in 1842 and 1853 they saw a revival under a somewhat changed order of life, although with the same chief purpose of mutual assistance. Labor associations for the purpose of buying at wholesale and more cheaply (the German *Konsumvereine*) and societies for aid in finding employment were new phases of the gradual organization of labor. There were also co-operative concerns, spoken of before, where the workmen were their own employers, dividing the profits. These, however, were rarely a success, and the workmen complained that the law frequently placed greater difficulty in the way of the poor laborers' union, established for whatever purpose, than in that of the employers forming their

syndicates for the exploitation of the public. The liabilities of these societies before the law possess some importance (pp. 632-38). The last stage in the development was the formation of the international labor union promulgated by the meeting of delegates from all nations in London in 1864. But the International was paralyzed from the start by sectionalism and the prevalence of the communistic ideas, and was doomed to be but a monster demonstration of the most far-reaching and least practical phases of the labor movement (pp. 641-51).

The industrial system has enriched society, but it has condemned large portions of the working population to a precarious and often miserable existence. M. Levasseur wonders whether, all things being equal, the workman's condition has really been improved. The thick dust of the factory clogs the breath, the heat rises to an insuperable height. Every moment he is exposed to danger to life or limb. He is compelled to stand up till he is ready to drop with fatigue. Women and children quickly succumb to infirmities, and there is hardly an occupation which does not expose the laborer to some malady or accident which may forever impair his strength or ruin his health. Life is nowhere easy, but a struggle against misery which man can conquer only by using his mental and physical faculties. What keeps the country laborer in health in spite of his scant fare is the good fresh air. And for the laborer in the factory, good wages, good food, and warm clothing, supplemented by sanitation in general, may counterbalance his hardships. Precautions began, indeed, to be taken by the manufacturers; thus machinery was fenced, but they were as yet not so general as they should have been, and in the mines there were none at all. As far as the homes were concerned, horrifying details, which seemed as if taken out of sensational story-books, were of the commonest order, and here the exhausted workman spent his hours of leisure, slept, lived, and died, if life in these circumstances was not in itself death. M. Levasseur, however, hastens to tell us that this was but the extreme and an exception rather than the rule. But often, even with the utmost industry, a shortage was the general result, and in cases of sickness the situation was deplorable. The question of wages for this period is complicated by the general rise in prices. From 1848 to 1870 the monetary situation was materially changed by the large amount coming from the gold mines in California and Australia, and prices rose as much as 15 per cent. for manufactured goods and 67 per cent. for natural

products. In 1857 many articles suddenly fell in price owing to speculation, or rose according to scarcity of supply. Lodgings, however, rose rapidly and remained high. After 1864 matters somewhat recovered their equilibrium, but the subsequent rise in wages really meant little or nothing (pp. 706-37).

The author's next subject is that of education, the most important phase of which was still primary instruction. In 1850 there were 60,579 primary schools; in 1863, some 8,000 more. At this time 36,854 communes had schools. Girls' schools had increased to 6,000. The number of pupils had grown to more than four million in 1863. Public schools had gained 800,000 pupils, and private ones 200,000; lay schools had 376,000, and those kept by the religionists 588,000. In his memoir of December 21, 1864, Duruy stated that the 17,206 schools of the religionists contained 1,610,673 pupils (which may give some idea of the magnitude of the present agitation in France). That the instruction of girls, especially among the lower classes, was hardly inferior to that of the boys, the author considers of greatest importance for the moral improvement of the nation. Americans will appreciate his remarks about the value of the school as an asylum from evil habits, and where propriety and social virtues may properly be inculcated. Yet, in spite of the large ciphers and after thirty years of efforts, France did not occupy the place in regard to popular education which belonged to a great nation, and the author compares her in this respect with other states on the continent, to Scandinavia, England, and the United States. Primary instruction in France as elsewhere had its opponents who, in conformity with the time-honored views of Governor Berkeley, thought education not conducive to submissiveness. While in 1827-29 of 100 recruits 44.8 were able to read and write, in 1866-68 there were 78.6, and, after the downfall of the empire 1876-80, the number had increased to 84.8. In certain portions of France this encouraging result was even surpassed. With the ministry of Duruy education became at once obligatory and gratuitous. His reforms are interesting reading (pp. 750-66).

In a particular chapter M. Levasseur discusses the morals of the laboring class, whose faults he finds to be everywhere the same — drunkenness and indecency (pp. 767-85); and he touches besides upon the condition of the apprentices who, because of the cost of lodgings, were now housed by the masters under their own roof. The period of instruction was greatly shortened and the fitness of the worker correspondingly reduced. The sense of personal dignity had

increased among the workmen, the fear of their superiors disappeared, and, while they became emancipated, they became also restive and even defiant. Universal suffrage gave into the hands of the workman a weapon which changed his character. He now saw the solicitous care of the government concentrated upon him, upon his weal and woe, and, like all powers, he had his flatterers. This was especially the case during the second republic, but even afterward he remained someone to be counted with. He was courted for his vote. He understood his importance and wanted his weight to be felt. Influenced by the new doctrines and the taste for reading, the workmen spoke of the tyranny of capital, and dreamt of a social condition where there should be neither bourgeois nor proletarian, neither patrons nor workmen. The public libraries aided him in gaining a wider view in other directions as well, although the quantity of his reading was often superior to its quality.

M. Levasseur concludes the volume with a comprehensive summing up in broad statements of what he has previously taken such pains to verify in detail. His method of presenting his subject gives his history more the character of a report, with specifications attached, than that of a general narrative with facts grouped subordinate to a partly scientific, partly æsthetic principle; yet no one can say that he has neglected either the facts or the placing of them against their proper background of historical conditions and events. It is not for us to bestow praise upon an author of such renown for completeness of research and sanity of view, and we can only say that M. Levasseur has created a work of truly absorbing interest to every student.

A. M. WERGELAND.

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING.